DEVELOPED WINTER SPORTS ADMINISTRATION

FOREST SERVICE ROLE, DUTIES AND TRAINING NEEDS

Prepared for
the Course in
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MANAGEMENT
Forest Service, U.S.D.A.
and the
Department of Recreation and Park Administration
Clemson University

by

Miles F. Weaver

Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison
National Forests

March, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix

ABSTRACT

Forest Service winter sports administration of developed ski areas has developed from involvement with small rope tow ski areas in the 1940's to today's administration of large, complicated ski resorts. Forest Service Manual policy and direction have not always kept current with the needs and practices of field units, which has caused concerns and confusion on winter sports administration in the field. Attempts to revise the Forest Service Manual direction on winter sports administration have not been successful to date, although a recent draft revision is in the review process. A general Forest Service role statement on winter sports administration is presented along with general recommendations on needed manual revisions. Assumptions are made on the Forest Service role and used as a basis to evaluate possible future Forest Service alternatives for winter sports administration. The recommended alternative utilizes current procedures combined with a zone specialist concept. It utilizes efficient and prudent administration procedures, provides employee career opportunities, and reduces the costs of administration. It also can be used as a means to initiate new administration techniques. Lists on training needs, elements of the job, acceptable standards, and references are included in the appendix along with a paper on successful administration.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to identify what the Forest Service role, duties and training needs are for the administration of private developed winter sports sites on Forest Service land. It includes tools that can be utilized by Forest Service line and staff, particularly Snow Rangers. A section on background information is used to help understand and document what the current situation appears to be. Recommendations are then made concerning Forest Service Manual policies, while making some assumptions about what immediate future Forest Service policy will be. Alternative methods of administration are presented and from these alternatives a recommended course of action is presented, showing the cost-benefits of that recommendation. The Appendix contains examples on different elements of ski area administration and other supplemental information.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Background - Forest Service involvement with developed ski areas began in the early 1940's in the Eastern states (Vermont and New Hampshire). Prior to this, there had been some skiing and competitive ski jumping on National Forest System lands, but these were events, not developed ski areas. In the latter part of the 1940's ski areas started to develop in the Western states, primarily in the coastal areas. Most of these ski areas were community type areas with ties to ski racing. Generally a rope tow or T-bar was the initial uphill facility. The popularity of skiing began to increase rapidly in the later 1940's and Forest Service involvement grew along with the growing ski areas.

Up until the 1960's, ski areas generally started small and gradually developed with some of them now large areas. During the 1960's large amounts of investment capital became available for the development of ski areas and entire areas were developed initially such as Vail, Snowmass, Crystal Mountain and Jackson Hole. Prior to and during this period, Forest Service administration of ski areas generally meant

active involvement in the every day decision of running the ski area and if avalanche hazards were present, the Forest Service supervised and performed portions of the avalanche control program. With the advent of initial large-scale construction for major ski areas from nothing, the administrative role of the Forest Service became much more complicated. Another complicating factor was that the existing smaller ski areas that the Forest Service already administered were growing into larger ski areas without good, long-range planning. At the end of the 1960's, the environmental laws came into effect which further complicated the Forest Service's administration of ski areas, mainly construction of new facilities or new ski areas.

A report was prepared for the Forest Service in 1970, titled "Task Force Report, The Training Program in Winter Sports Administration". Although the report was aimed at assessing the winter sports training program and making recommendations, it served to paint a picture of the winter sports administration program at that time. The following overview is a quote from that report.

> "Even a cursory examination of the winter sports training situation serves to identify several rather obvious points:
>
> 1. There has been a great deal of high caliber work throughout our winter sports program. Needed changes are primarily a response to changing conditions and should not be allowed to diminish the many outstanding efforts of the past.
>
> 2. People who have been involved with the winter sports situation for any appreciable time have generally formed rather strong opinions regarding the Forest Service position and direction in the field.
>
> 3. Historical positions and actions in the winter sports activities have had a major influence on our programs.

4. Our avalanche control training is automatically and inseparably linked with our avalanche control program, and the key issue of the latter is the degree of active Forest Service participation in the control work.

5. There is a serious question regarding our utilization of trained personnel in the past. After years of effort we can count very few people at the professional level of expertise in the avalanche field. This may be partially the result of failure to establish career opportunities. It may also reflect inadequate training in some cases.

6. The field of winter sports offers truly tremendous opportunity for public service and imagery for the Forest Service. Winter sports is now big business. It is an industry that is on the up-swing of a boom cycle and one that presently has considerable "sex appeal" with the general public. Many ski area operators now have a multitude of management expertise available to them to handle their daily operations. Also, many states now have lift inspection organizations coming into their own. Consequently, the need for the Forest Service to play an integral part in the day-by-day operational activities at the ski areas has changed tremendously. This would seem to indicate that the really large opportunity in the training field is to provide leadership in areas such as avalanche control, where we alone have the access to truly technical expertise or in new fields such as planning, design and coordination of construction methods where we can "break new ground".

7. There is a rather distinct separation between the needs and opportunities involving training in winter sports administration as compared to avalanche control."

This report was then broken down into two parts: discussions on training for avalanche and discussions on the administrative program. As a

result of this report, the National Avalanche School was established by the Forest Service in 1971, and in 1973 a National Winter Sports Symposium was held in Denver, Colorado, which addressed planning and development of ski areas. Recommendations from the report concerning regular administrative training were not closely followed, although some regions did give them some emphasis in regional training based on the report.

In 1976 and 1977 a ski lift activity review was prepared by four key Forest Service employees, knowledgeable in their individual specialized fields regarding winter sports. The following quote is from their executive summary.

"Six major deficiencies have been identified in our current program. To assure a strong and effective lift safety program, improvement is required in:

1. Program direction including program management, priority and implementation.

2. Commitment, understanding and dedication to a full involvement by management and specialists.

3. Administrative support, funding and manpower.

4. Insuring the adequacy of performance and service of outside specialists whom we rely on to implement parts of the safety program.

5. Emphasis in developing professional administrative and support personnel with specialized technical expertise and skills.

6. Program involvement to enhance creditability, knowledge, and skills; and, to promote effective cooperation with others.

The current program, even with these deficiencies, is fundamentally sound and can be remedied to redeem our responsibilities in this

high risk area. No radical departure from current policies and procedures is in order. However, rigid implementation of the current safety program requirements is vital.

The following remedial measures are essential:

1. National direction to reaffirm that the Forest Service policy is to provide administrative control, to provide leadership in appropriate aspects of ski lift safety, to give emphasis to this task in relationship to other Forest Service activities and to establish priorities.

2. Funding and personnel ceiling must be provided to attain administrative goals commensurate with both the establishment level of involvement and an acceptable level of risk.

3. Establishing and enforcing attainable standards of design, construction, maintenance and operation of the facilities.

4. Programs to establish the qualifications of outside service personnel, to monitor their performance and to assure their compliance.

5. Training programs and career incentives to develop and retain a continuing of skilled professional administrators, engineers, and technicians in this specialized activity. These programs must be broad enough so people moving through this field will also be fully skilled to perform needed tasks.

6. An increased involvement with the ski lift industry to assure essential cooperation and improve Forest Service creditability.

7. A system approach to critically evaluate the ski lift safety program and to maintain minimum acceptable levels of risk.

8. Uniformity of standards, procedures, and program objectives."

Based on this review, an action plan was developed which was briefly:

1. Revise and update Forest Service Manual (FSM), Section 2342; Development Sites in Private Sector, Winter-Sports Sites.

2. Revise and update Forest Service Manual (FSM), Section 7320; Tramways, Ski Lifts and Tows.

3. All Regional Foresters fully implement current ski lifts safety programs without further Regional supplementations pending receipt of a modified national direction. (This was to dispel current uncertainty regarding the future of the program).

In July, 1978, a revised FSM 2342 draft was sent to the field for review but it was not finalized or implementated. Emphasis was placed on ski lift safety programs in each region in response to Item 3 of the action plan.

Current Situation - Today a revised FSM 2342 or FSM 7320 still has not been issued from the Washington Office. A new draft of both has just recently been sent to the field for review and winter sports administration has been emphasized by most regions, but there are many concerns about the conflicting national direction still in existance in the manual.

In reference to the ski lift activity review, a December 29, 1977, 1410 Washington Office memo was sent concerning revising the two sections of

the manual (FSM 2342 and 7320). The following guidance was stated in the memo.

"The following guidelines will be followed or recognized by those revising the directives.

1. The Forest Service accepts the primary responsibility for establishing and interpreting health and safety standards for facilities and services provided on National Forest lands.

2. Forest Service permittees are responsible for complying with such standards as a condition of occupancy of National Forest land.

3. Inspections by State Tramway Engineers, engineers in private practice, or others need not be duplicated by the Forest Service, but inspection by others does not relieve the Forest Service of its responsibilities for insuring that the terms of the permit are being met.

4. Maintenance of the specialized expertise in ski lifts, avalanche control, and other phases of winter sport administration required to redeem the Forest Service's role require active participation of Forest officers in these activities at permitted operations.

5. No substantial changes in funding, manpower or other administrative support is expected for this specific function.

6. Mutual planning for safety and operations will be used as the primary procedural mechanism for establishing objectives, stating problems, agreeing on solutions, and fixing responsibility for on-going safety programs for each ski area.

7. The District Ranger will continue to be the responsible official for administering winter sports special use permits, including gaining permitee compliance with applicable ski lift safety standards.

8. To maintain our leadership role in ski lift safety we must emphasize coordination with Federal, State, and local agencies and with private organizations with overlapping interests and responsibilities.

9. Where State and local laws apply, Forest Service policy is to cooperate with the authorities responsible for their enforcement (FSM 2316.15). A maximum of cooperation and a minimum of duplication is intended (FSM 7321.4).

10. Supervision and control of ski development, maintenance, and operation must be accomplished within the provisions of special use permits."

The above still appears generally applicable although in the latest draft of FSM 2342 and 7320 it is toned down somewhat, particularly in Items 4, 8, and 10 regarding "active participation", maintaining our "leadership role" and "supervision and control". The Forest Service may be developing more into a coordinating "dual" leadership role with other aspects of the industry. The term "supervision and control of ski lift development, etc." is old terminology and today it is recognized that the Forest Service should be administrators.

To better understand the current situation in Forest Service winter sports administration, issues and concerns expressed in individual discussions, group meetings, etc., have been summarized into three categories; Forest Service management concerns, ski area management issues and Snow Ranger concerns. They are:

1. Forest Service Management Concerns.

   A. Forest Service policy needs to be updated.

   B. Job is there without the dollars.

   C. What should the job be? How much time should it take?

   D. What's the priority of the job in relation to other dollar needs?

   E. Why all the time and dollars needed? (Administration and training).

   F. Only involved with crisis and problems - a real pain.

   G. What makes a good Snow Ranger?

   H. We're doing too much for the ski area and they should be fully responsible.

   I. A play time activity when there are more important things.

   J. There's a shortage of experienced Snow Rangers.

2. Ski Area Management Issues:

   A. Snow Ranger too involved in the running of the ski area. Can't do anything without his approval.

   B. Snow Ranger documentation and decisions adds to ski area liability exposure.

   C. Snow Ranger not competent, but still makes decisions affecting ski area.

D. Snow Ranger makes decisions outside his authority.

E. Question the existing "godfather" role of the Forest analysis and administration).

F. Snow Ranger not there enough to know all he should, but still makes decisions affecting area, (lack of dollars or time). Means crisis management, a less smooth administration process.

G. Snow Ranger who's knowledgeable and useful not always utilized in other aspects of permit administration, just day-to-day winter operations (master plans, construction analysis and administration).

3. Forest Service Snow Ranger's Concerns:

A. Lack of a defined job (the degree of administration expected and the duties uniformly applied from ski area to ski area).

B. Lack of training for maintenance and improvement in job and for development of new Snow Rangers. Lack of good training methods and personnel.

C. No career opportunities.

D. Need Snow Ranger qualifications established (minimum).

E. Lack of support and understanding from above in the Forest Service.

F. Lack of adequate compensation for hazards, equipment and clothing involved in job.

G. New personnel are thrown into the job without adequate qualifications or experience.

H. Explosive training requirements and methods - Snow Ranger involvement.

I. What is the Snow Ranger's liability (particularly new Snow Ranger trainees).

J. Lack of flexibility in skiing uniform and equipment purchases.

As these issues and concerns surface, there still is quite a bit of confusion regarding the Forest Service's role in administering developed ski areas and a concern from the people on the ground doing the job, that what they are doing is necessary and the prudent and liability safe way to do it.

According to FSM 2342, the prime objective in winter sports administration is to prevent accidents, including those related to ski lifts and tows and avalanche hazards. A further objective is to prevent occurrences which might lead to claims against the government under the Tort Claims Act. It is clear that the Forest Service's existing direction is geared to the safety aspects of special use permits administration. An excellent "Summary of Forest Service Manual References Concerning Public Safety at Recreational Sites Under Special Use Permits" was compiled by Bob Brandenberger, Forester, Forest Service, Recreation Management, Northern Regional Office. This summary is included in the appendix for reference purposes.

METHODOLOGY

Forest Service Policies

Brandenberger, in a talk on "The Forest Service Role and Responsibilities for Ski Area Safety (1974)", said, "The duties and responsibilities of Forest Service land managers for public safety at permitted recreation operations are outlined in numerous manual references. Because the manual is written by various authors over periods of time, there are some inconsistencies and variations in the degree of supervision and inspection required, but the basic intent of maintaining safe obser-

vations through Forest Service controls is clear. The requirements of special use permit clauses, which District Rangers are required to administer, also establish responsibilities for the Forest Service. The role the Forest Service has assumed through its policies and requirements of the special use permits, to a large extent, define the Forest Service's legal responsibilities." and -"Federal agencies are not subject to regulation by the states. Federal law is surpreme to state law whenever both deal with the same subject matter. However, the code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 251.1(a)(2) states: "special use permittees shall comply with all State and Federal law and all regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture..." Clause 7 of the standard term special use permit (2700-5) requires permittees to comply with all Federal, State, county and municipal laws, ordinances or regulations which are applicable to the area or operations covered by the permit. Therefore, where Federal, State or local ordinances deal with the same matter -- ski lifts, sanitation, building codes -- the most stringent requirements will be governing (FSM 2316.15). Where State and local laws apply, Forest Service policy is to cooperate with the authorities responsible for their enforcement (FSM 2316.15). Inspections by county sanitarians, State tramway engineers, or other authorities need not be duplicated by the Forest Service, but inspection by others does not relieve the Forest Service of its responsibilities for insuring that the terms of the permit are being met. This can be done by evaluating the qualifications of inspectors, the quality of their reports, and by spot Forest Service inspections." -- and -- "The responsibility for inspection to insure public health and safety is the permittee's; official inspections are for the purpose of seeing to it that permittees are redeeming their responsibilities (FSM 2716.51). Safety or operation plans for ski areas are for the purpose of clearly fixing the responsibility for safety measures (FSM 2342.53). Good plans include systems for the permittees self inspection. It also permits the Forest Service administrator to check on compliance."

Although Brandenberger sums this up well, the FSM 2342 policies still cause the majority of confusion for the field regarding the Forest Service's role and responsibilities in ski area administration. Revision of special use clauses for ski areas in FSM 2780 is also needed.

At this time most regions have developed their own clauses due to the obsolete clauses in the white pages of the manual.

I believe the Forest Service role in developed winter sports is to:

1. Provide winter recreation opportunities at developed ski areas.

2. Provide leadership in planning and user safety through research and technical assistance to other Government agencies and private enterprise.

3. Provide for a healthful and safe environment for the using public through establishing standards that the permittee is responsible for and the Forest Service monitors for, to determine that the permittee is redeeming his responsibilities.

4. Share Forest Service expertise through research and technical assistance.

5. Coordinate to insure there are no unwarranted duplication of efforts and that the programs of the Forest Service and the State and private industry are complimentary.

6. Maintain expertise in the field to the level that the Forest Service is an accepted member of the ski area business community and has specialists available to determine that standards are being followed, etc.

7. Protect the resource from significant impact. This would include the skiing resource and facilities as well as the land base, and would be accomplished through proper planning (review), development, and operation.

The Forest Service should fulfill this role by administering ski areas, not helping manage them.

The main concept in FSM 2342 needing revision is in relation to the ski area operator's responsibility for safety and the Forest Service's role. It should clearly be defined that the permittee is responsible for all health and safety measures. The special use permit and supplemental items such as the area safety and operating plan should clearly define the standards that the Forest Service will evaluate as for compliance. The Forest Service role in avalanche control must be completely revised to show permittee responsibility for all forecasting and control actions. The Snow Ranger does not supervise ski areas and make decision as to what slopes are safe (existing manual statements say he does). The ski area personnel has this responsibiltiy. The manual revision should allow latitude for Forest Service personnel to take part in avalanche control and other phases of winter sports administration for training purposes in order to maintain or to develop the specialized expertise we need to redeem the Forest Service's role of judging others competence. Firing of military artillary weapons by Forest Service personnel for avalanche control must be provided also with the goal of phasing out these types of activities, and the permittee should bear this expense.

The current draft revision of FSM 2342 appears to do the above, and if adopted, will provide up-to-date policies under which the field can operate. When the draft is finalized and issued in the manual, each Region should review their own Regional manual supplements for conformity, revise where needed, and issue additional supplements to clarify special problem[illegible]thin their own regional areas.

A good tool, which was developed in Region 2 for budgetary planning purposes, is the regional acceptable standard for ski area administration (See Appendix I). The general format of this is good, although it is too specific and tells field personnel they need to spend so many days at the area based on heavy use, holidays, etc. The general subject areas covered in this standard could be utilized more efficiently by the field if they were written in a management by objectives type approach, leaving flexibility for the field to interpret the frequency of inspections or monitoring needed. It is an excellent start towards budgetary planning to assure that the Forest Service does have adequate money for ski area administration. These standards help to establish better uniformity of administration between different units of the Forest Service.

Another way to establish uniformity would be to do more standardization of the ski area safety and operating plan. This plan is part of the special use permit and its importance has been recognized. There is still quite a variation in how it is prepared, what is in it, and its legal implications.

Forests would need little, if any, policy revision or supplementation. Their role should be to improve coordination between lower levels and themselves and coordinate all information concerning winter sports administration, the use of available expertise in winter sports administration, and the uniform application, if possible, of winter sports administration techniques and policies.

Assumptions - The following assumptions are made as a basis for the remainder of this report.

1. A radical change in Forest Service Winter Sports policy or direction will not take place. The current revised draft of FSM 2342 will not change significantly in its final form. It is the overall basis of the Forest Service role.

2. The responsibility for public safety and health at permitted developed ski areas is the permittee's. The Forest Service's role is to see that the permittee is redeeming his responsibilities.

3. Adequate standards can be established in safety and operating plans and maintenance plans (as proposed in the revised FSM 2342 rough draft) and administrative methods adopted that will allow Forest Service monitoring of permittee performance without Forest Service active involvement in managing the ski area.

4. The revised National direction will help establish consistency and will allow for Regional and local adoptions within general policy direction.

5. The Forest Service will allow other authorities to monitor permittee compliance where laws are applicable and it can

still insure the objectives of permit administration are being met.

6. Some degree of active participation by Forest Service specialists in avalanche control and other activities will be needed to maintain individual's expertise or train new personnel. Active participation does not mean supervision or making decisions for the permittee.

7. A method must be developed and adopted that allows establishing minimum Snow Ranger qualifications and determines the amount of training or experience needed for Snow Ranger positions. This must be in the form of multi-aspects guidelines so that bits and pieces of the total assembled data can be used to formulate the qualifications needed for a specific Snow Ranger job. This would be a tool a Forest or District could use to also evaluate the adequacy of their ski area administration personnel and to plan what supplemental assistance they might need.

Alternatives - The following are alternative ways to carry out the assumed Forest Service policy on developed winter sports administration. They are based on the assumptions listed above and are supplemented by examples in the appendix.

1. Continue Current Procedures

This alternative could be defined very broadly since there appears to be much variation in how ski area administration is accomplished currently. Regardless of variations in the way Snow Rangers perform their duties, it is assumed that throughout the Forest Service, a Snow Ranger is assigned to a ski area (or ski areas if several exist on a District) to administer the special use permit under the District Ranger's authority. He generally is a "jack of all trades" and administers all phases of the permit. Some specialized help is needed, primarily engineering, for administering the ski area

operation, and resource specialists assistance for analysis of additional development of the ski area. Depending on the size of the ski area and the degree of commitment for proper administration by the District Ranger, he may or may not be fully knowledgeable about ski area administration and the operation of the ski area. Snow Ranger expertise tends to increase with the size of the ski area and with the number of ski areas in the adjacent area or on the Forest. Where one small ski area is on a Forest without others nearby, the Snow Ranger usually is not as well trained or as knowledgeable as those at larger areas or where winter sports are a big part of the Forest program.

The Snow Ranger can seek assistance if it is available. At the Forest level, if ski areas are a significant part of the overall recreation program, the recreation staff usually has some experience in ski area administration and can assist the Snow Ranger. Where winter sports are a very minor part of the recreation on the Forest, generally the recreation staff has limited knowledge in winter sports administration. Forest engineers involved in winter sports are usually only on heavy winter sports work load Forests and Regional engineers are relied upon otherwise.

The Region 2 acceptable standard for ski area administration is a good example of what might be considered current procedures with an adjustment: the Snow Ranger does less in avalanche forecasting and recording and visits the area less frequently than prescribed in that standard (see appendix I).

2. Zone Program with Specialists

The concept of using zoned expertise is not new within the Forest Service, with engineering departments taking the most advantage of this concept. In engineering, it is usually several zones within the Forest where the engineering expertise is utilized, but in some

instances, such as law enforcement, a specialist is utilized between two to four Forests. If adequate tools were developed to establish standards and allow efficient monitoring of ski areas, it is possible that the Forest Service would not need the traditional Snow Ranger at each ski area.

General administration could be accomplished with less experienced personnel on the District and a specialist team approach used to evaluate specific ski area operations and their compliance with the standards established. These specialists would serve an identified zone which might include several Districts when winter sports are a heavy work load on the Forest or up to several Forests where winter sports are a minor activity in their recreation program.

A minimum of two specialists would be needed; engineering for lift and other facility evaluations and a winter sports specialist for general administration of the special use permit. Avalanche experience might be required for the winter sports specialist, if avalanche hazards exist.

The use of these specialists, along with any other needed, such as county health, sanitation, or those experienced in ski area construction, could be combined with District personnel to make both formal announced inspections and unannounced, informal inspections for establishing permittee compliance with the special use permit. The frequency and intensity of inspections would depend upon the ski area's ability to comply with and willingness to comply with the agreed upon standards and guidelines in the maintenance and operating plans as well as the special use permit. These specialists would be involved in establishing the standards in those plans also.

The use of this type of system would allow a broader base support for financing winter sports specialists who could be more involved in the broad recreation management aspects of their duty station.

These specialists working as a team would apply a broader viewpoint to winter sports administration and could be utilized in evaluating master plans and proposed new construction.

This general concept is informally being tried in Region 6 this year with certain Snow Rangers being designated as the experts within an established zone. They help the ski area Snow Rangers within their zone with particular problems or training needs, etc. They do not presently perform inspection type activities.

3. Combination of Current Procedures and Zone Specialists

Having a trained individual to administer a ski area at the District level has its advantages as well as having specialists stationed in zones who can be more efficient and more easily financed for their time and participation. The logical thought to combine the two approaches is easily reached and presented here as the third alternative.

For Districts where there is a large winter sports work load such as the Dillon Ranger District on the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest and where four large ski areas exist, having a highly trained and experienced Snow Ranger is efficient, prudent and necessary. The Aspen Ranger District on the White River National Forest would be another example.

There are other areas where one small tow or chair lift exists on a Forest or several Forests within a general area. This is where it might be more practical to have an identified specialist to serve that area for overall administration and draw from another source for engineering expertise. A study would be prepared with criteria established to determine where and how each approach might be used the most efficiently. All participants would have to be committed to this type of approach as it would involve sharing expertise

between Districts and/or Forests. The specialist could be located in Forest head-quarters or at a District office. This combination of approaches would probably give a more uniform application of ski area administration while being more efficient where the work load is low.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Administration Methods

The current procedure of having a Snow Ranger on each District that has winter administration responsibilities is really only efficient where the work load is sufficient to require that type of expertise. Where ski area operation is competent and efficient, the use of a general-type special use administrator seems more logical with the availability of "off" District specialists to assist the general administrator. Alternative 3 (combination of Current Procedures and Zone Specialists) is the best approach for future winter sports administration.

The Forest Service role in administering developed winter sports sites is changing from a role of involvement in the management and operation aspects of the ski area to a role of establishing the standards and guidelines of the operation and monitoring the operation to determine that these standards and guidelines are being followed or met. With better documented standards and guidelines and methods available to adequately monitor that they are being followed, a general-type special use permit administrator can be used. To establish these standards and guidelines and to determine in questionable areas that they are being followed, takes a true specialist. Once standards and guidelines are established and proven as workable in practice, less administration will be needed from the specialist standpoint. To maintain expertise, however, does involve a certain degree of doing and involvement in the job of administering the ski areas.

To summarize, Alternative 3 - Combination of Current Procedures and Zone Specialists, is the recommended Forest Service winter sports administration procedure. Rationale for that recommendation is:

1. Under the current procedures (Alt. 1), the best and most experienced Snow Rangers exist where there are large ski areas and/or heavy winter sports administration work loads. It is efficient and prudent to continue to use these positions to train for and maintain the expertise needed to establish standards and guidelines and evaluate permittee compliance and competence.

2. On Forests where winter sports is a minor activity, it is difficult to maintain expertise for such a small portion of an individual's job. Therefore, if needed specialists were placed within the existing organization and identified, a general-type administrator could handle the ski area administration job and utilize the specialists to assure adequate standards and guidelines are established and are being complied with. The concept of sharing specialists between Districts and Forest would need to be accepted, as well as the finances worked out in advance.

3. Many ski areas are to a competent level of operation that present Forest Service inspections and presence does not really accomplish improvement or discover significant problems. A zone-specialist program for occasional assurance that the operation is continuing to be run up to its high competence level is all that is needed along with a general-type special use administrator.

4. By emphasizing use of winter sports specialists in other than the traditional Snow Ranger role, it will give Snow Rangers a better career opportunity. They can move into the higher levels of recreation management, but still be involved in winter sports.

5. The changing emphasis on how the Forest Service administers ski areas means adopting of new administration procedures. Utilizing the traditional Snow Ranger position where the work load justifies, and incorporating the zone-specialist concept gradually would allow the change to take place for new as well as "old hands" in the winter sports program.

Duties and Training

The original intent of this paper was to establish, in detail, what the duties and training needs of a Snow Ranger are. In reviewing the revised FSM 2342 and 7320 drafts and in discussing ski area administration with other experienced Forest Service personnel, it was determined that Forest Service ski area administration is in a significant state of change, not so much the role, but how the Forest Service accomplishes the task. The role of the Snow Ranger, as defined in the manual, had changed in practice before now which confused the field personnel as to what they should be doing from a liability standpoint (i.e., the Forest Service Manual still had them making ski area decisions and supervising avalanche control work). The revised FSM 2342 and 7320 drafts bring the manual up to date with the present and initiates, to a greater extent, the setting of standards and guidelines and the monitoring (not inspecting) to assure that they are being met and followed. Thus, the duties and training needed will not be the same as what was needed in the recent past, when Snow Rangers were inspecting and involved in the day-to-day operation of the ski area.

The future will see less and less of the Forest Service Snow Ranger "on the hill" as ways are found to adequately define and monitor ski area operation and maintenance standards and guidelines. It will be more difficult to maintain expertise due to the lesser involvement in the day-to-day operations of the ski areas. But, what expertise exists can be utilized more fully by giving personnel more career opportunities through the use of zone specialists. Professionals may become more involved which will create better understanding in the different Forest Servcie levels of the needs of winter sports administration.

It was determined that too much detail in defining the Snow Ranger job would be self-defeating because of the changing situation. The job has been broken down into the Elements of Winter Sports Administration and the Region 2 acceptable standard for ski area administration was revised to reflect the changing situation. An outline has also been prepared concerning the possible training needed to maintain or develop a specialized winter sports administrator (Snow Ranger). These are included in the Appendix (II, III and IV) along with a paper on "Successful Special Use Administration" by Jim Durdan, Forest Service, Region 9 (Appendix V). Being a good administrator is the key to a successful job and this paper provides a lot of good hints and guidelines on administration. The above items can be used to arrive at detailed management-by-objectives job descriptions.

Cost-Benefits of Recommendations

The Region 2 acceptable standard for ski area administration (Appendix I) was used for budgetary purposes on the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests for projecting the Fiscal Year 1982 budget. This base, revised to reflect the assumptions stated earlier, was used to compare continuing current procedures to Alternative 3, the combination of current procedures and zone specialists. Three ski areas are located on three different Ranger Districts on the Forests. They are the Telluride, Crested Butte, and Powderhorn ski areas. Total man-days are broken down into administration and training as well as District and Supervisor's Office project needs. It is assumed that program management and general administration costs will not change between the comparisons.

The difference between the two alternatives in organization is, that under Alternative 3, general-type administrators are used at Norwood and Collbran Ranger Districts with one winter sports specialist continuing to be stationed at Taylor River. The Supervisor's Office would have one lift engineer and one winter sports specialist. When needed,

a team could be formed of these three specialists that would adequately cover the areas of lifts, avalanche, and other winter sports administration.

Under the current procedures, each District would have a winter sports specialist.

The table on the following page summarizes the differences in costs of the past administration, continuing the organization under the assumptions (Alt. 1), and going to a combination of current procedures and zone specialists (Alt. 3).

This is a rather simple comparison, but it does show the financial advantages of changing how the Forest Service administers winter sports using the assumptions stated. More money could be saved if the organization staffing on the three Forests was changed to use a combination of current procedures and zone specialists.

COST COMPARISON: PAST ADMINISTRATION TO ALTERNATIVE 1 TO ALTERNATIVE 3

Item	FY 82 Base (mandays)	Revised Base to reflect assumptions (mandays)	Alternative 3 (mandays)
Supervisor's Office			
Administration	60	60	70
Training	25	25	20
Subtotal	85	85	90
Taylor River R.D. (Crested Butte)			
Administration	180	120	140
Training	10	15	15
Subtotal	190	135	155
Norwood R.D. (Telludire)			
Administration	176	115	70
Training	10	20	5
Subtotal	186	135	75
Collbran R.D. (Powderhorn)			
Administration	90	40	30
Training	5	10	5
Subtotal	95	50	35
Forest Totals	556 mandays	405 mandays	355 mandays
Forest Costs (total mandays X $102.00) (av. cost)	556 X $102.00 = $56,712.00	405 X $102.00 = $41,310.00	325 X $102.00 = $36,210.00

SUMMARY

This report has given a background perspective on Forest Service winter sports administration from the start of small rope tow ski areas to the later initial development of large ski areas such as Vail. Forest Service involvement was originally well into the day-to-day decisions of ski area management, but has gradually changed to administering the requirements of the special-use permit. The Forest Service Manual has not kept current with these changes as several Forest Service reports have documented as well as a list of concerns and issues compiled for this report.

Attempts in 1978 failed to finalize a revision of the Manual, and another revision draft is presently being reviewed by the field offices. Although certain Forest Service papers and memos have summarized the Forest Service role in winter sports administration, the personnel in the field have continued to be confused and frustrated by lack of clear manual direction.

A general Forest Service role statement on winter sports admininstration is presented in this report along with general recommendations about needed manual revisions.

Assumptions are stated concerning the Forest Service role in winter sports administration and are used as a basis to evaluate possible future Forest Service alternatives for administering winter sports sites.

Three alternatives are presented:

1. Continue Current Procedures - District Snow Ranger at every ski area.

2. Zone Program with Specialists - Work load determines area to be covered by specialists (winter sports and

lift engineer) which are not necessarily stationed at District Offices. District has general special use administrator.

3. Combination of Current Procedures and Zone Specialists - The best elements of Alternative 1 and 2 are combined.

The recommended alternative is Alternative 3 - Combination of Current Procedures and Zone Specialists. It utilizes the most efficient and prudent administrative procedures while providing career opportunities for Forest Service Snow Rangers. It also reduces the costs of administration. It can be used as a means of initiating new administration techniques (the establishment of better standards and quidelines and monitoring to determine that they are being complied) which may not be accepted readily by "old hand" Forest Service Snow Rangers.

Literature Cited

Brandenberger, R.O. 1976. The Forest Service Role and Responsibilities for Ski Area Safety. Paper presented at the November 4, 1976 Winter Sports Symposium, Denver, Colorado.

Durdan, Jim, 1980. Successful Special Use Administration. Paper presented at Region-9 Ski Lift Operation and Maintenance Workshop. North Conway, New Hampshire.

U.S Forest Service, 1970. Task Force Report - The Training Program in Winter Sports Administration. Chief's Office, U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.

U.S. Forest Service, 1977. Ski Lift Safety Activity Review. 1410 Management Reviews (2300). Chief's Office, U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.

U.S. Forest Service, 1977. 1410 - Management Reviews Memo, dated December 29, 1977. Subject: Ski Lift Safety Activity. Chief's Office, U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.

U.S. Forest Service, 1978. 2340 Development Sites in Private Sector Memo, dated June 28, 1978. Subject: FSM 2340. Chief's Office, U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.

U.S. Forest Service, 1981. Forest Service Manual, Sections 2340, 2710, 6730, 7320 and 7420. Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests, U.S.D.A., Delta, Colorado

U.S. Forester Service, 1981. 2340 Development Sites in Private Sector - 7320 Tramways, Ski Lifts, and Tows Memo, dated February 5, 1981. Subject: Draft FSM 2340 and 7320. Chief's Office, U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX I

Activity Description and Standard	MIH Code No.	MIH Code Unit of Measure
RECREATION MANAGEMENT (Private and Other Public Sector)	A16	
Special Uses - Developed Recreation Sites	360	
Ski Area Administration	960*	PAOT days
A. Special Use Permit	960	PAOT days
1. General Provisions		
Annually, review special use permit and Master Site Plan to insure adequacy of provisions. Update when deficiencies are present.		
a. Annually, review proposed lift rate increases as submitted by permittee. Use Regional evaluation criteria and Washington Office manual direction. To be submitted no later than April 15.		
b. Annually, monitor and inspect compliance of facility operations with State and OSHA health and safety requirements. Buildings allocated to public use should be inspected a minimum of four times per season, one being pre-season. Have permittee correct deficiencies immediately.		
c. Semi-annually, review permittee compliance with required health and safety inspection schedules on water and sewage treatment systems. One pre-season review required.		
d. Annually, monitor permittee compliance with Civil Rights requirements.		
e. Annually, review the current ski area permitted capacity for operation and administration. Update permitted capacity when evaluation criteria indicates a need.		

*(Region 2 - MIH code 960 is a part of MIH code 360.) Report unit of measure for R-2 MIH code 960 separately and as a part of MIH code 360.

Activity Description and Standard	H I H Code No.	Unit of Measure
B. Administration - Winter Operations	960	Each day
1. Pre-season		
a. Annually, by October 1, cooperate with permittee in preparing Winter Sports Site Safety Plan.		
b. Annually, participate in pre-season inspection of lifts as required by States, insurance companies, and/or Colorado Passenger Tramway Safety Board. Insure adequacy of review as means to redeem Forest inspection responsibilities. Follow up and inspect permittees compliance with required corrective action according to schedule.		
c. As planned, participate in all local test operations associated with new and revised lift operations. (Do not include load tests associated with new winter sports sites which are not operational.)		
d. Prior to season, analyze Ski Patrol program for adequacy of compliance with Site Safety Plan.		
e. Annually, inspect winter sports site prior to opening facilities. Public health and safety compliance and conditions will be corrected by permittee before area is opened to general public.		
f. Prior to season, analyze permittee avalanche preparedness to manage both Classes A and B sites.		
2. Operating Season		
a. Weekly, monitor permittee compliance with Winter Sports Site Safety Plan. Have significant deficiencies in operation corrected promptly.		

Activity Description and Standard	MIH Code No.	MIH Code Unit of Measure
b. Prior to February 15, revise provisions of site safety plan with permittee for adequacy of application when needed.		
c. Provide as a minimum, six comprehensive reviews per lift per year spaced throughout ski season. Close lifts when public safety hazards are present, until corrected.		
d. Perform on-site review of overall area management operations in accordance with permit provisions, including permittees' administration of visitor use. Ski trail inspections will be conducted as part of the overall on-site review to insure grooming, trail management activities, and signing are functioning properly. Request damaged or missing regulatory signs be repaired or replaced promptly. Check for public and employee safety hazards and have permittee correct immediately.		
Actual time will vary with size of area, facilities, and visitor use distribution based on the following Frequency Schedule:		
(1) Low Use Days - 0-25 percent of permitted capacity; one visit per week.		
(2) Moderate Use Days - 26-75 percent of permitted capacity.		
- Areas with capacity less than 1500 S.A.O.T.; one visit per week on weekend days as a minimum. Two visits per week over Christmas and New Year holiday period and George Washington's birthday heavy use holiday.		
- Areas with capacity over 1500 S.A.O.T; three visits per week as a minimum, one being over a weekend day.		
(3) Heavy Use Days - 76 percent of permitted capacity; one visit per day.		
(Schedule on-site presence by projecting weather forecast conditions, previous day's actual recorded use, mountain slope conditions, and historical knowledge of use patterns.)		

Activity Description and Standard	H I H Code No.	H I H Code Unit of Measure
e. Seasonlong and as needed, monitor permittee's avalanche snow-safety plan application directly.		
(1) Monitor and assist avalanche forecasting and hazard reduction on all Class A avalanche sites - seasonlong.		
(2) Under likely avalanche conditions, monitor permittee activities on Class B sites to insure adequate control.		
(3) Monitor permittee's storage, transportation, and on-site use of explosives for avalanche control work. Snow ranger with explosive training must be present on all Class A site explosive work.		
(4) Provide input and monitor avalanche hazard forecasting activities and reporting procedures with Avalanche Warning Center in Fort Collins, Colorado seasonlong.		
f. Daily, monitor each special event or activity requiring individual permits or approvals to insure compliance.		
g. Monitor compliance and application of State safety act provisions by permittee and local law enforcement officials. Prior to each ski season, review permittee and local law enforcement officials understanding of on-site responsibilities. (In Colorado, "Ski Safety Act of 1979.")		
h. Complete required administrative reports on use and accident reporting, including accident investigations.		

Activity Description and Standard	H I M Code: No.	Unit of Measure
C. Administration - Summer Operations	960	PAOT days
1. Pre-season		
a. One pre-season inspection on lift operations where summer visitor activities are involved.		
b. Prior to starting summer work projects and/or opening facilities to general public, mutually prepare with permittee Summer Use-Site Safety and Operating Plan.		
c. Annually or as needed, participate in preparation of permittees project construction schedule. Prepare Environmental Assessment of proposed operation when required.		
2. Operating Season		
a. In conformance with the frequency schedule, review summer maintenance plan and slope maintenance activities to obtain quality work. Construction activities involving facility replacement, expansion, and site modifications will be reviewed for compliance with approved plans and the following frequency schedule:		
- 1 on-site visit prior to activity, with permittee.		
- 2 or more visits, depending on scope and complexity of work, during operations.		
- 1 compliance review after work completed, with permittee.		
b. Bi-monthly, monitor permittee's compliance with Summer Use-Site Safety and Operating Plan. Have deficiencies in operation corrected promptly.		
c. Monthly during summer use season, inspect lift operations.		
d. Twice monthly, inspect summer slide operations with one inspection during weekend use period.		
(Administration of many standards can be done concurrently when on site. Size of area and visitor use along with on-the-ground conditions will dictate actual time.)		

APPENDIX II

REGIONAL ACCEPTABLE STANDARD
(Revised by M. Weaver)

MAINTENANCE LEVEL

Program Level _____

Activity Description and Standard	M I H Code No.	Unit of Measure
RECREATION MANAGEMENT (Private and Other Public Sector)	A16	
Special Uses - Developed Recreation Sites Ski Area Administration	360 960*	PAOT da
A. Special Use Permit	960	PAOT da
1. General Provisions		
Annually, review special use permit and Master Site Plan to insure adequacy of provisions. Update when deficiencies are present.		
a. Annually, monitor lift rate increases as established by permittee.		
b. Annually, monitor for compliance of facility operations with State and OSHA health and safety requirements. Buildings allocated to public use should be inspected a minimum of two times per season, one being pre-season.		
c. Semi-annually, review permittee compliance with required health and safety inspection schedules on water and sewage treatment systems, once during the pre-season and once during operating season.		
d. Annually, monitor permittee compliance with Civil Rights requirements.		
e. Annually, review the current ski area permitted capacity for operation and administration. Update permitted capacity when evaluation criteria indicates a need.		

*(Region 2 - MIH code 960 is a part of MIH code 360.) Report unit of measure for R-2 MIH code 960 seperately and as a part of MIH code 360.

REGIONAL ACCEPTABLE STANDARD
(Revised by M. Weaver)

MAINTENANCE LEVEL

Program Level ____

Activity Description and Standard	M I H Code	
	No.	Unit of Measure
B. Administration - Winter Operations	960	PAOT days
1. Pre-season		
a. Annually, by October 1, cooperate with permittee in updating Winter Sports Site Operation and Maintenance Plan.		
b. Annually, participate as needed in pre-season inspection of lifts as required by States, insurance companies, and/or Colorado Passenger Tramway Safety Board. Insure adequacy of review as means to redeem Forest inspection responsibilities. Follow up and monitor permittees compliance with required corrective action according to schedule.		
c. As planned, participate in all local test operations associated with new and revised lift operations.		
d. Prior to season, analyze Ski Patrol program for adequacy of compliance with revised Site Operation and Maintenance Plan.		
e. Prior to season, analyze permittee avalanche preparedness to manage both Class A and B sites.		
2. Operating Season		
a. Throughout operating season, monitor permittee compliance with Winter Sports Site Operating and Maintenance Plan. Have significant deficiencies in operation corrected promptly.		

Activity Description and Standard	M I H Code	
	No.	Unit of Measure
b. Prior to February 15, revise provisions of Site Operation and Maintenance Plan with permittee for adequacy of application when needed.		
c. Monitor ski lift operations and documentation throughout operating season as needed to determine site operating and maintenance plan compliance. Take action when needed.		
d. Perform on-site review of overall area management operations in accordance with permit provisions, including permittees' administration of visitor use. Ski trail inspections will be conducted as part of the overall on-site review to insure grooming, trail management activities, and signing are functioning properly.		
e. Seasonlong and as needed, monitor permittee's avalanche snow-safety plan application directly.		
(1) Monitor avalanche forecasting and hazard reduction on all Class A avalanche sites - seasonlong.		
(2) Under likely avalanche conditions, monitor permittee activities on Class B sites to insure adequate control.		
(3) Monitor permittee's storage, transportation, and on-site use of explosives for avalanche control work.		
(4) Provide input and monitor avalanche hazard forecasting activities and reporting procedures with Avalanche Warning Center in Fort Collins, Colorado seasonlong.		
f. Monitor special events or activity requiring individual permits or approvals to insure compliance when new type activity or major in nature.		

Activity Description and Standard	M I H Code No.	Unit of Measure
g. Monitor compliance and application of State safety act provisions by permittee and local law enforcement officials. Prior to each ski season, review permittee and local law enforcement officials understanding of on-site responsibilities. (In Colorado, "Ski Safety Act of 1979.")		
h. Complete required administrative reports on use and accident reporting, including accident investigations.		
C. Administration - Summer Operations	960	PAOT da
1. Pre-season		
a. Prior to starting summer work projects and/or opening facilities to general public, mutually prepare with permittee Summer Use-Site Operating Plan.		
b. Annually or as needed, participate in preparation of permittees' project construction schedule through input and review. Prepare Environmental Assessment of proposed operation when required.		
2. Operating Season		
a. Review summer maintenance plan and monitor slope maintenance activities to obtain quality work. Construction activities involving facility replacement, expansion, and site modifications will be reviewed for compliance with approved plans.		
b. Monitor permittee's compliance with Summer Use-Site Operating Plan. Have deficiencies in operation corrected promptly.		
c. During summer use season, monitor lift operations as needed.		

REGIONAL ACCEPTABLE STANDARD
(Revised by M. Weaver)

MAINTENANCE LEVEL

Program Level _____

Activity Description and Standard	M I H Code	
	No.	Unit of Measure
d. Monitor summer slide operations as needed, with one observation made during weekend use.		
(Administration of many standards can be done concurrently when on site. Size of area and visitor use along with on-the-ground conditions will dictate actual time.)		

APPENDIX III

Elements of Winter Sports Administration

Developed Sites

I. Avalanche

- A. Forecasting
  - 1. Weather Knowledge (expected conditions)
  - 2. Current and past conditions
    - a. records
    - b. snowpits
    - c. test skiing
    - d. fractureline inspection
- B. Dispersing Forecasts
  - 1. Avalanche network
  - 2. Ski area personnel
  - 3. Local public
- C. Control
  - 1. Action plan (Daily and long term)
    - a. Explosives (hand charges, weapons)
    - b. Protective skiing
    - c. Closures
- D. Explosives storage

II. Facilities

- A. Lifts and tows
  - 1. Operation (signs, ramps, operators, etc)
  - 2. Maintenance (logs, annual, preventive, etc)
  - 3. Inspections (annual, monthly, daily)
  - 4. Load tests
- B. Base area (and on slope buildings) facilities
  - 1. Buildings
    - a. Public
    - b. Maintenance, Service, etc.
  - 2. Walks, decks, etc.
  - 3. Parking

III. Slope Management

- A. Hazards
- B. Signing
- C. Grooming
- D. Improvement

IV. Search and Rescue

- A. Avalanche
- B. Lost skier, etc.

V. General Administration

A. Communications and coordination

B. "Crisis" management

C. Complete picture of area operation (total area)

D. Accident investigations and reports

E. General reports (Use, etc.)

F. Short and long range planning
   1. Ski area development
   2. Forest Service administration

G. Site operation and maintenance plan
   1. Compliance
   2. Revisions

VI. Public Relations and Education

A. Availability
   1. Advise and answer questions
   2. Educate (and train)
   3. Represent Forest Service

VII. Training - (See winter sports administration needed training list)

A. Development

B. Maintenance and improvement

VIII. Summer Activities

A. Summer public operations

B. Maintenance - improvement projects

C. New construction projects
   1. EA preparation
   2. Plan reviews
   3. monitor construction

D. Resource protection evaluations

<u>Dispersed Winter Recreation</u>

I. General knowledge of back country

II. Hazards

A. Back country avalanche hazard forecasting

B. Other hazards to using public

III. Winter trails (cross country and snowmobiles)

IV. Informal snowplay sites

V. Outfitter-guide operations

VI. Gather use information

APPENDIX IV

Winter Sports Administration Training Needs

Development (new Snow Ranger)

The Forest Service role in Winter Sports Administration responsibilities.

Special Use Administration
- The Special Use Permit - What it is and means (legal)
- Administration Techniques - Public Relations
- Decision Making - Problem Solving Techniques
- Operating and Maintenance Plan Supplement

Lift and Tow Administration
- Terminology - components
- Design basics
- Operation basics
- Legal requirements for operation
- What to monitor

Avalanche (if needed - consider dispersed as well as devleoped)
- National School (for major involvement)
- Local Training (for minor aspect of job)
- On-the-ground and overview of his area
- Explosives

Other Facilities Administration
- Public buildings
- Maintenance - Service (sewage, etc)
- Other (Parking, walkways, etc.)

Slope Administration
- Hazards, signing, improvement

Search and Rescue

Documentation - Paperwork
- Recording administration activities, reports, etc.

Accident investigation

Dispersed winter recreation management (includes outfitter-guide administration)

Ski Area development and improvement
- Planning
- Assessment
- Administration

Resources Protection

Skiing Improvement

Maintenance and Improvement (Experienced Personnel)

"State-of-the-Art" updates

Risk Management

Concepts of Ski Area Planning

Feasibility Studies

Significant Problem Solving by groups

Show and Tell

On Site Reviews and Coordination

Refreshers

Policy Updates

APPENDIX V

SUCCESSFUL

SPECIAL USE ADMINISTRATION

by

JIM DURDAN, OCTOBER 1980

I Introduction

Successful Special Use Administration requires some specific talents, among them common sense, practice of the Golden Rule, knowledge of the use we are administrating and knowledge of objectives and policies of the Forest Service.

Today we will review, in a basic context, some key items of importance in successful special use administration.

II Body

A. People are different.

1. No two are alike.
2. Tailor your approach to the individual.
3. Know the other persons interests, concerns, philosophy.
4. Know yourself. You may have some personality trait that may be offensive to the other person, such as talking and not listening, swearing, smoking, dress or mannerisms.

   Don't try to be something you aren't. Try to recognize your shortcomings and suppress them accordingly.

B. Attitude

1. Is it enforcement of permit requirements by the letter.
   or

2. Serving as a partner to provide a safe, enjoyable experience for recreationists, as well as provide a profitable operation for management.

3. Checking Attitudes
   a. Correspondance - What is the tone of the letters. What is reflected there? Can you sense the attitudes in the wording?

4. Permit Compliance

a. Not an end unto itself

b. The permit is a tool. Enforcement of terms must be tempered with common cause.

c. The permit cannot cover all circumstances. Knowledge of the intent of the terms of the permit, the direction provided in 2300, 2700 and 7300 and good judgement are essential ingredients in effective decision making.

d. Look at the operation as a system. Look for ways to improve the way we are doing business, not only from the public service standpoint, but from the profitability standpoint.

e. The best approach is 'how can we work together to make this a safe, enjoyable experience for the skiers and a profitable one for you?'

5. Monitoring the Operation

We should not be out on the hill making long laundry lists of observed problems for the manager to correct.

The list can be made, but only to assist you in determining why there is a problem and if the manager has developed a process to correct the problem or if there a breakdown in the process.

Start looking for causes rather than treating symptoms. The laundry list approach to problems solving is an indication that we are placing bandaids on symptoms rather than going after the cause of the problem. In many cases you will find a common thread through many of the problems that will provide a good indication of the problems cause.

There will be cases where problems jeprodizing the health and safety of the user will have to be corrected immediately. This does not mean that once the situation is corrected that you should not seek, identify and correct the underlying cause of the problem.

6. Documentation and Good Records

Documentation and good records are extremely important to you as well as your replacement.

Verbal agreements made between the Forest Service and ski area management must be documented. Many a relationship has been compromised because of our inability to track and follow verbal committments. (Site houseboat case)

Documentation also important from a legal standpoint. Document the circumstances involving equipment malfunctions even if there are no injurys. This will protect you, the permittee and Government in case some onelects to sue.

Document all committments made between you and the operator and send a copy to the operator.

Document interim trips to the area when following up on the progress of the committments. When items of work have been completed make sure they are noted with a copy sent to the manager.

7. Follow-up/Follow-through

Follow through on your requested action. If you threaten an action because deficiencies or problems aren't corrected, follow through with the action.

Is this a very common problem? Where we continually tell or write management about serious deficiencies that must be remedied. No follow-through is made, the operation continues along, business as usual, doing nothing of consequence about the deficiences. The operator and Forest Service travel onward on separate tracks. This may go on for several years.

Failure to follow through will result in loss of respect from the permittee, and could eventually result in a serious accident. Don't threaten an action you cannot back up. Be firm and consistent.

8. Anticipation of Planning

Many of the same problems or jobs come up at the same time each year. Try to anticipate these situations and have a plan in mind to deal with the situation when it arises.

9. Pre Operations Conference

Although not a requirement, pre-operations conferences enable the Forest Service and management to establish common objectives, identify and develop plans to deal with common problems and review progress on meeting past committments.

When setting up these meetings, follow prescribed meeting conventions. Develop an agenda, request the presence of key individuals, prepare your points, make sure we have the people there that have the authority to make committments. Document the meeting.

A good share of effective Special Use Administration is no more than applied Management by Objectives.

10. Human Relations

a. Get acquainted.

b. Know who does what.

c. Observe the chain of command. If you have a problem, discuss it with the area manager, not with someone who has no authority to act in managements behalf. (These responsibilities/designations should be made at the pre-operations meeting.

d. Get to know the operation, and managements problems, limitations and view points. This will enable you to be alot more responsive in assisting management in developing programs, processes or systems that will be mutually beneficial, as well as to avoid unreasonable requests.

e. Do not make committments for the Forest Service that are outside your authority. Make sure you're clear about who has the authority to do what.

f. If you don't know the answer to a question, don't wing it. Find the answer and get the information back to the manager.

g. Be responsive. Don't let inquires from the permittee sit in the in-basket. If the response requires time, acknowledge receipt of the request and tell them when they can expect the inquiry.

h. Don't jump to conclusions. Allow the manager an opportunity to express his side of the issue and to take appropriate action.

i. Use management as a resource in developing alternative solutions to a problem. An open discussion will give management a better perspective of our position and perhaps direct them to support or even suggest our preferred alternative.

II Communications

a. Defensive Communications.*
Avoid the pit falls of communications that create a defensive rather than a supportive climate.

Behavior which a listener perceives as possessing any of the characteristics listed in the left-hand column arouses defensiveness, whereas that which he interprets as having any of the qualities designated as supportive, reduces defensive feelings.

Categories of Behavior Characteristics Found in Defensive and Supportive Climates:

Defensive	Supportive
1. Evaluation	1. Description
2. Control	2. Problem Orientation
3. Strategy	3. Spontaneity
4. Neutrality	4. Empathy
5. Superiority	5. Equality
6. Certainity	6. Provisionalism

1. Evaluation and Description
Speech or other behavior which appears evaluative increases defensiveness. If by expression, manner of speech, tone of voice, or verbal content, the sender seems to be evaluating or judging the listener, then the receiver goes on guard. Of course, other factors may inhibit the reaction. If the listener thought that the speaker regarded him as an equal and was being open and spontaneous, for example, the evaluativeness in a message would be neutralized and perhaps not even perceived. The same principle applies equally to the other five categories of potentially defense-producing climates. The six sets are interactive.

Sometimes the simplest question usually conveys the answer that the sender wishes or implies the response that would fit into his value system. A mother, for example, immediately following an earth tremor that shook the house, sought for her small son with the question, "Bobby, where are you?" The timid and plaintive "Mommy, I didn't do it" indicated how Bobby's chronic mild defensiveness predisposed him to react with a projection of his own guilt and in the context of his chronic assumption that questions are full of accusation.

* Excerpts from an article from the Journal of Communications titled 'Defensive Communication' by Dr. Jack R. Gibb.

Descriptive speech in contrast to that which is evaluative, tends to arouse a minimum of uneasiness. Speech acts which the listener perceives as genuine requests for information or as material with neutral loadings, is descriptive.

2. Control and Problem Orientation
Speech which is used to control the listener evokes resistance. In most of our social intercourse someone is trying to do something to someone else--to change an attitude, to influence behavior, or to restrict the field of activity. The degree to which attempts to control produce defensiveness depends upon the openness of the effort, for a suspicion that hidden motives exist heightens resistance.

If the speaker secretly views the listener as ignorant, unable to make his own decisions, uninformed, immature, unwise or possesed of wrong or inadequate attitudes is a subconscious perception which gives the listener a valid base for defensive reactions.

Methods of control are many and varied. Legalistic instance on detail, restrictive regulations, policies, and all laws are among the methods. Gestures, facial expressions, other forms of nonverbal communication are means of imposing one's will upon another and are potential sources of resistance.

Problem orientation, on the other hand, is the antithesis of persuasion. When the sender communicates a desire to collaborate in defining a mutural problem and in seeking its solution, he tends to create the same problem orientation in the listener.

He implies that he has no predetermined solution, attitude, or method to impose. Such behavior is permissive in that it allows the receiver to set his own goals, make his own decisions, and evaluate his own progress--or to share with the sender in doing so.

3. Strategy and Spontaneity
When the sender is perceived as engaged in strategy involving ambiguous and multiple motivations, the receiver becomes defensive. That which is concealed, also, may appear larger than it really is. the degree of defensiveness of the listener is often proportional to the perceived size of the suppressed element.

A large part of the adverse reaction to much of the so-called human relations training is a feeling against what are perceived as gimmicks and tricks to fool or to "involve" people to make a person think he is making his own decision.

Similarly, the deliberate attempt at being simple and naive is also resented.

Behavior which appears to be spontaneous and free of deception is a defense reducer. If the communicator is seen as having uncomplicated motivations, as being straightforward and honest, and as behaving spontaneously in response to the situation, he is likely to arouse minimal defense.

4. Neutrality and Empathy
When neutrality in speech appears to the listener to indicate a lack of concern for his welfare, he becomes defensive.

Speech with low affect that communicates little warmth or caring also communicates rejection.

Communication that conveys empathy for the feelings and respect for the worth of the listener, however, is paticularly supportive and defense reductive. Reassurance results when a message indicates that the speaker identifies himself with listener's problems, shares his feelings, and accepts his emotional reactions at face value.

Abortive efforts to deny the legitimacy of the receiver's emotions may impress the listener as lack of acceptance. The combination of understanding and empasizing with the other person's emotions with no accompanying effort to change him is highly supportive.

Gestural behavioral cues in communicating empathy should be mentioned. Facial and bodily evidences of concern are often interpreted as especially valid evidence of deep-level acceptance.

5. Superiority and Equality
When a person communicates to another that he feels superior in position, power, intellectual ability, physical characteristics, or other ways, he arouses defensiveness. Aroused feelings of inadequacy causes the listener to center upon the affect of the statement rather than upon the elements of the statement. The receiver then reacts by not hearing the message, by forgetting it, or by competing with the sender.

The person who is perceived as feeling superior communicates that he is not willing to enter into a shared problem-solving relationship, that he probably does not desire feedback, that he does not require help, and/or that he will be likely to try to reduce the power, the status, or the worth of the receiver.

Defenses are reduced when one perceives the sender as being willing to enter into participative planning with mutual trust and respect. Differences in talent, ability, worth, appearance, status, and power often exist, but the low defense communicator seems to attach little importance to these destinctions.

6. Certainty and Provisionalism
The effects of dogmatism in producing defensiveness are well known. Those who seem to know the answers, to require no additional data, and to regard themselves as teachers rather than as partners tend to put others on guard.

Listeners often perceive expressions of certainty as connoting inward feelings of inferiority. This kind of behavior often associated with acts which other reguard as attempts to exercise control.

One reduces the defensiveness of the listener when he communicates that he is willing to experiment with his own behavior, attitudes, and ideas. The person who appears to be taking provisional attitudes, to be investigating issues rather than taking sides on them, to be problem solving rather than debating, and to be willing to experiment and explore tends to communicate that the listener may have some control over the shared quest or investigation of the ideas.

If a person is genuinely searching for information and data, he does not resent help or company along the way.

The implecations of supportive communication techniques for manager and administrator are fairly obvious.

Arousing defensiveness interferes with communication and thus makes it difficult--and sometimes impossible--for anyone to convey ideas clearly and to move effectively toward the solution of managerial problems.

III Conclusion

Successful special use administration involves several personnel and professional skills.

We have covered:

- People are Different
- Attitudes
- Permit Compliance

- Monitoring the Operation
- Documentation

- Follow-up and Follow-through
- Anticipation and Planning
- Pre Operations Conference
- Human Relations
- Communications

I think if I was to boil this whole thing down we would come up with three ingredients that will make you a successful administrator.

1. Know the rules - FSM, ANSI, Managements Operation
2. Practice the Golden Rule
3. Use Common Sense.

APPENDIX VI

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY OF FOREST SERVICE MANUAL REFERENCES
CONCERNING PUBLIC SAFETY AT RECREATION SITES
UNDER SPECIAL USE PERMITS

FSM	DIGEST
2331.32 & 7421.23	Requires bacteriological water sampling at all developed sites.
2341.3	Privately financed developments will be administered to comply with terms of the special use permit and protect public health and safety.
2342.33 (7320)	Requires inspection of ski lifts and tows to make sure they are safe and properly maintained. (Also see R-1 Supplement.)
2342.34	Requires winter sports structures to be planned for safety, convenience, and proper area sanitation.
2342.44	General sanitation and facilities (winter sports) will be accorded the same attention prescribed for Forest Service developed sites.
2342.45	Establishes supervision and inspection requirements at winter sports sites and provides for State cooperation for ski lift inspection. (Also see FSM 7325.32.)
2342.51	Establishes responsibilities of operator and Forest Service for avalanche control supervision at winter sports sites. (Also see R-1 Supplement.)
2342.53	Requires safety plan for winter sports sites to fix responsibility for safety measures. (Also see R-1 Supplement and FSM 7324.32.)
7320.32	Requires aerial tramways to conform to most recent ANSI standard.
7323.1	Inspection requirements for aerial tramways.
7324.21 & 22	Requires operating and maintenance plans for aerial tramway installations.
2343.12	Sanitation and water supply requirements at organization camps--includes sleeping quarters, playfields and infirmaries.
2343.22	District Rangers will enforce measures for the protection of public health and safety on every organization camp. Lists items to be regularly inspected. (Also see FSM 2343.25.)

2343.34	Fire prevention at organization camps.
2344.2	Site plans at concession sites must include public health and safety measures.
2716.51	Requires permittees to currently inspect buildings and areas covered by special use permit to insure that the public safety, health and welfare are adequately protected.
2716.52	District Rangers are responsible to ensure that special use terms are met. Requires regular inspections including public safety, sanitation . . . and other critical items which may involve liability.
2316.15 (also 36 CFR 251.1)	Establishes policy to comply with all applicable State, county, and municipal laws. Such laws will not preclude the application of more stringent regulations as necessary. Provides for cooperation, technical advice, and assistance from other agencies.

APPENDIX VII

Reference List: Winter Sports Administrator

General

The Winter Sports Administration job requires that the Winter Sports Administrator be familiar with specific references, directions, and plans. These specific references, directions, and plans include:

1. Forest Service Manual, 2720 (Special Uses)
2. Forest Service Manual, 2342 (Winter Sports Administration)
3. Forest Service Manual, 6730 (Accident Reporting)
4. Forest Service Manual, 7320 (Aerial Tramways, Ski Lifts and Tows)
5. American National Standard - Safety Requirements for Aerial Passenger Tramways (ANSI. B77.1 Standards).
6. Special Use Permit for each ski area on the District.
7. Operating and Maintence Plan for each ski area on the District.
8. Operating specifications and component familiarity for individual lifts and tows on District ski areas.
9. Aerial Tramways Ski Lifts and Tows - Description and Terminology. 1975, Forest Service, U.S.D.A. EM-7320-1
10. State laws and regulations relating to aerial tramways, lifts and tows.
11. Avalanche Handbook. 1976. Agriculture Handbook 489, Forest Service, U.S.D.A.
12. Instrumentation for snow, Weather and Avalanche Observations. 1970, revised 1973. Snow Safety Guide Number 2. Wasatch National Forest, U.S.D.A.
13. The Snowy Torrents: Avalanche Accidents in the United States 1967-71. 1975. General Technical Report RM-8 Forest Service, U.S.D.A.
14. Evacuation of Aerial Passenger Tramways & Ski Lifts. Forest Service, U.S.D.A. EM-7320-2
15. Planning Considerations For Winter Sports Resort Development. 1973. Forest Service, U.S.D.A. in cooperation with National Ski Areas Association.